REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 22-26, and 28-31 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 22-26, and 28-31 have been amended and claims 2, 6-11, 15, 19, 21, 27, and 32 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 3, 8-12, 30, and 31 were found to be objectionable for containing unclear phrases. Amendments have been made to clarify all of the phrases noted by the Examiner, whether these phrases appear in the claims as rejected or have been incorporated in one or more independent claims to distinguish the references cited by the Examiner.

Claims 15-17 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for reciting terms that lack antecedent basis or are otherwise unclear. Claim 15 and 21 have been canceled and claims 16 and 17 have been amended to depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that these changes are sufficient to overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that claim 1 does not recite any affirmative steps of the method. These same claims were rejected under 35 USC § 101 for similar reasons. Claim 1 has been amended to recite affirmative steps of the method, to thereby obviate the § 112, second paragraph, and § 101 rejections.

Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18-21, and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by the Egan patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

11

Claim 1 recites determining if a packet call corresponding to the target IP address exists in a packet data protocol context database, and "if the target IP address does not exist in the packet data protocol (PDP) context database, setting a trigger flag for the target IP address" and "performing at least one of a tracing or monitoring operation for the packet call or target IP address based on the set trigger flag." The Egan patent does not disclose these features added by amendment to claim 1, i.e., Egan discloses performing a call-tracing operation for a call transmitted over the internet from a mobile phone (e.g, a mobile VoIP call). But, Egan does not disclose the determining, setting, and performing steps added by amendment to claim 1.

Without a disclosure of these features, the Egan patent cannot anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims. Withdrawal of the § 102 rejection as applied to these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite features similar to those that patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Egan patent. It is therefore submitted that claim 18 and its dependent claims are allowable over Egan.

Claim 20 recites that the tracing or monitoring step includes checking whether the target IP address is an effective IP in a network to which a corresponding subscriber belongs, and if it is checked that the target IP address is the effective IP address, activating the call tracing and monitoring of the target IP address. The Egan patent does not disclose any of these features. Applicants therefore submit that claim 20 and its dependent claims are allowable over Egan.

12

Claims 10-12, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of an Egan-Kuo combination. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 1. In order to render claim 12 obvious, the Kuo patent must therefore teach or suggest the features of base claim 1 missing from the Egan patent.

The Kuo patent discloses a method for filtering a call. To perform this function, filter circuits check whether a flag has been set. If so, a transmitter or receiver is disabled to thereby cut off the call path between the transmitting and receiving terminal. (See column 4, lines 21-33). The Kuo patent, therefore, discloses cutting off a call completely, not performing a tracing or monitoring function.

Moreover, the Kuo patent does not teach or suggest all of the features added by amendment to claim 1, including "determining if a packet call corresponding to the target IP address exists in a packet data protocol context database." And, "if the target IP address does not exist in the packet data protocol (PDP) context database, setting a trigger flag for the target IP address" and then "performing at least one of a tracing or monitoring operation for the packet call or target IP address based on the set trigger flag." Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that an Egan-Kuo combination cannot render claim 1 and its dependent claims obvious.

Dependent claim 12 separately recites that "if it is determined that the target IP address exists in the packet data protocol context database, then performing at least one of tracing or monitoring of the packet call or the target IP address without setting said trigger flag for the target IP address." (Emphasis added).

13

Claim 22 depends from claim 20. In order to render claim 22 obvious, the Kuo patent must therefore teach or suggest the features of claim 20 missing from the Egan patent.

Claim 20 recites that the tracing or monitoring step includes "checking whether the target IP address is an effective IP in a network to which a corresponding subscriber belongs; and if it is checked that the target IP address is the effective IP address, activating the call tracing and monitoring of the target IP address." The Kuo patent does not teach or suggest performing such a check, and then performing a call tracing or monitoring function in response to results of such a check. Without a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that an Egan-Kuo combination cannot render claim 20 and its dependent claims obvious.

Dependent claim 22 recites that "if it is checked that the target IP address is not the effective IP address in the network to which the corresponding subscriber belongs, returning the system to a state before the request for tracing and monitoring of the target IP address is produced in the IP network." The Kuo patent also fails to teach or suggest this checking or of the returning step that is conditionally performed based on a result of the checking step.

Claim 24 recites tracing or monitoring a call of the target IP address by "determining that the packet call having the target IP address does not exist in a packet data protocol context database, setting a trigger flag of the target IP address, and if the packet call having an IP address with the set trigger flag exists in the packet data protocol context database, starting the packet call tracing or monitoring of the target IP address." The Kuo patent does not teach or suggest this determining step,

14

or any of the subsequent steps that are conditionally performed based on results of the determining step. Without a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that an Egan-Kuo combination cannot render claim 24 and its dependent claims obvious.

Claims 17, 25-29, and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Egan and Kuo taken in combination with one or more of the Sjoblom, Igarashi, Haumont, or Rantalainen publications or the Miettinen patent. Applicants traverse this rejection on grounds that these secondary references fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 1, 18, 20, and 24 missing from the Egan and Kuo references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: June 27, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610